

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 24, 2004. Newly added Claims 95-104 are presented for examination, of which Claims 95, 96, 98, 100, 101 and 103 are in independent form. Claims 89-94 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 89-94 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,335,267 (Evers) in view of U.S. Patent 4,533,956 (Fedde). The claims now pending are believed to be clearly allowable over those patents, for at least the following reasons.

Independent Claim 95 is directed to a character data processing method in a system which comprises a personal computer and a facsimile machine connected through a public network to a remote facsimile machine connected through an interface to the personal computer. In the method of Claim 95, key code data is input by a keyboard of the personal computer, and is converted into character code data for the facsimile machine by referring to a conversion table, and the result is registered in a database. The character code data for the facsimile machine registered in the database is transmitted to the remote facsimile machine through the facsimile machine.

Evers relates to a system in which a first code, such as ASCII, is converted into a second code for a facsimile machine. Moreover, *Fedde* relates to an apparatus in which facsimile code data is converted into an intermediate code by using a table.

Nothing has been found in either *Evers* or *Fedde* that would teach or suggest that, in a system which comprises a personal computer and a facsimile machine connected through a public network to a remote facsimile machine connected through the interface to the personal

computer, converted code is registered from the personal computer to the remote facsimile machine through the facsimile machine. For at least that reason, Claim 95, and also Claim 100, are deemed allowable over those two patents, taken separately or in any permissible combination.

Independent Claim 96 is directed to a character data processing method, for use in a system which comprises a personal computer and a facsimile machine connected through a public network to a remote facsimile machine connected through an interface to the personal computer. In the method of Claim 96, there is performed an inverse-conversion step, in which, when it is selected to read registration data, character code data for the facsimile machine registered in the remote facsimile machine is inverse-converted into character code data for the personal computer by referring to an inverse-conversion table for that purpose. In addition, a display is provided, based on the character code data for the personal computer inverse-converted in the inverse-conversion step.

Again, nothing has been found or pointed out in *Evers* or *Fedde* that would teach or suggest, in a system which comprises a personal computer and a facsimile machine connected through a public network to a remote facsimile machine connected through an interface to the personal computer, converting character code registered in the remote facsimile machine and displaying or printing (or both) the converted code data. For at least that reason, Claim 96 is believed to be allowable over those two patents, taken separately or in any permissible combination. These same distinctions apply to independent Claims 98, 101 and 103, as well.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references


against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 454621v1